EXHIBIT B

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

| MAPLEVALE FARMS, INC., |) | |
|--|---|-------------------------|
| individually and on behalf of all others |) | |
| similarly situated, |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiffs, |) | |
| |) | |
| v. |) | |
| |) | |
| KOCH FOODS, INC., JCG FOODS OF |) | Case No. 16-CV-8637 |
| ALABAMA, LLC, JCG FOODS OF |) | |
| GEORGIA, LLC, KOCH MEATS CO., INC. |) | and Related Cases |
| TYSON FOODS, INC., TYSON CHICKEN, INC., |) | 16-CV-8737; 16-CV-8851; |
| TYSON BREEDERS, INC., TYSON POULTRY, |) | 16-CV-8931; 16-CV-9007; |
| INC., PILGRIM'S PRIDE CORPORATION, |) | 16-CV-9421; 16-CV-9490 |
| PERDUE FARMS, INC., SANDERSON FARMS, |) | 16-CV-9589; 16-CV-9684 |
| INC., SANDERSON FARMS, INC. (FOODS |) | |
| DIVISION), SANDERSON FARMS, INC. |) | |
| (PRODUCTION DIVISION), SANDERSON |) | |
| FARMS, INC. (PROCESSING DIVISION), |) | |
| WAYNE FARMS, LLC, MOUNTAIRE FARMS, |) | Judge Thomas M. Durkin |
| INC., MOUNTAIRE FARMS, LLC, MOUNTAIRE |) | |
| FARMS OF DELAWARE, INC., PECO FOODS, |) | |
| INC., FOSTER FARMS, LLC, HOUSE OF |) | |
| RAEFORD FARMS, INC., SIMMONS FOODS, |) | |
| INC., FIELDALE FARMS CORPORATION, |) | |
| GEORGE'S, INC., GEORGE'S FARMS, INC., |) | |
| O.K. FOODS, INC., O.K. FARMS, INC., and |) | |
| O.K. INDUSTRIES, INC., |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |

ORDER

For reasons set forth orally at the status conference of December 9, 2016, the Court is now convinced that end-purchaser consumer plaintiffs require separate interim class counsel. The Court believes that interim class counsel for direct and

indirect purchasers have a conflict of interest because of the tension that exists as to how much of any alleged price increase was passed on by the direct and indirect purchasers to the end-purchaser consumer plaintiffs.

Before the Court are the applications for appointment as interim class counsel for end-purchaser consumer plaintiffs from Hagens Berman Sobol Shapiro LLP and Wolf Haldenstein Adler Freeman & Herz LLP. The Court has carefully reviewed the submissions and consulted with other judges who have familiarity with the two law firms. Both firms are well qualified based on experience and have adequate size and resources to competently represent the end-purchaser consumer plaintiffs. Moreover, both firms have local offices, so there is no need for the appointment of separate liaison counsel.

The Court appoints Hagens Berman as interim class counsel for the endpurchaser consumer plaintiffs, in large part because of their aggressive and
independent advocacy relating to the conflict that the Court earlier identified.
Although the Court in its previous order dated October 14, 2016 (R. 144¹) thought
there was simply a "potential" for a conflict, the Hagens Berman submission
renewing their request for appointment of separate counsel (R. 218) convinced the
Court to reverse its earlier decision. In the Court's view, Hagens Berman is in the
best position to advocate for the end-purchaser consumer plaintiffs.

¹ Citations are to the docket in the lead case, 16-CV-8637.

Case: 45/f6 4: 18/60 18/

In its submission, Hagens Berman represents that it can and will work

cooperatively and efficiently with other interim class counsel. The Court believes

Hagens Berman will be able to do so, and will expect nothing less.

For the foregoing reasons, the Application of Wolf Haldenstein Adler

Freeman & Merz LLP For Appointment As Interim Class Counsel For End User

Consumer Plaintiffs, R. 246, is denied and the Application For Appointment Of

Hagens Berman Sobeol Shapiro LLP As Interim Class Counsel For End Purchaser

Consumer Plaintiffs, R. 247, is granted.

ENTERED:

homas M Dukin Honorable Thomas M. Durkin

United States District Judge

Dated: December 14, 2016

3